

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	CSR 7826-E
Subsidiaries of Cablevision Systems Corporation)	CSR 7827-E
)	CSR 7828-E
Petitions for Determination of Effective)	
Competition in Communities in New York State)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: May 7, 2010

Released: May 7, 2010

By the Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Cablevision Systems Corporation, through several subsidiaries, hereinafter referred to as “Petitioner,” has filed with the Commission petitions pursuant to Sections 76.7 and 76.905(b)(4) and 76.907 of the Commission’s rules for a determination that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in those communities listed on Attachment A and hereinafter referred to as “Communities.” Petitioner alleges that its cable systems serving the Communities are subject to effective competition pursuant to Section 623(1)(1)(D) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (“Communications Act”)¹ and the Commission’s implementing rules,² and are therefore exempt from cable rate regulation in the Communities because of the competing service provided by Verizon, hereinafter referred to as “Competitor.” The petitions are unopposed.³

2. In the absence of a demonstration to the contrary, cable systems are presumed not to be subject to effective competition,⁴ as that term is defined by Section 623(l) of the Communications Act and Section 76.905 of the Commission’s rules.⁵ The cable operator bears the burden of rebutting the presumption that effective competition does not exist with evidence that effective competition is present within the relevant franchise area.⁶ For the reasons set forth below, we grant the Petition based on our finding that Petitioner is subject to effective competition in the Communities listed on Attachment A.

¹See 47 U.S.C. § 543(a)(1).

²47 C.F.R. § 76.905(b)(4).

³Petitioner states that, in part of the Town of Ramapo, Petitioner’s cable rates are regulated by the New York Public Service Commission (“PSC”); and that it is unsure whether the Town of Ramapo ever became certificated to regulate cable rates in another part of the Town, or delegated that authority to the PSC. Petitioner argues that “Verizon’s provision of cable service to the entire Municipality removes any doubt regarding the absence of authority to regulate Cablevision’s rates” and requests that we remove any state or local regulatory authority to regulate its rates anywhere in the Town. Petition in CSR 7826-E at 4 n.5. We find no flaw in Cablevision’s reasoning and, accordingly, we will rule on its Petitions for those all parts of the Town of Ramapo.

⁴47 C.F.R. § 76.906.

⁵See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l) and 47 C.F.R. § 76.905.

⁶See 47 C.F.R. §§ 76.906 & 907.

II. DISCUSSION

3. Section 623(l)(1)(D) of the Communications Act provides that a cable operator is subject to effective competition if a local exchange carrier (“LEC”), or its affiliate, offers video programming services directly to subscribers by any means (other than direct-to-home satellite services) in the franchise area of an unaffiliated cable operator which is providing cable service in that franchise area, but only if the video programming services offered in that area are comparable to the video programming services provided by the competing unaffiliated cable operator.⁷ This test is otherwise referred to as the “LEC” test.

4. The Commission has stated that the incumbent cable operator must show that the LEC intends to build-out its cable system within a reasonable period of time if it has not completed its build-out; that no regulatory, technical, or other impediments to household service exist; that the LEC is marketing its services so that potential customers are aware that the LEC’s services may be purchased; that the LEC has actually begun to provide services; the extent of such services; the ease with which service may be expanded; and the expected date for completion of construction in the franchise area.⁸ It is undisputed that these Communities are served by both Petitioner and Competitor, a local exchange carrier, and that these two MVPD providers are unaffiliated. The “comparable programming” element is met if a competing MVPD provider offers at least 12 channels of video programming, including at least one channel of nonbroadcast service programming⁹ and is supported in this petition with copies of channel lineups for Competitor.¹⁰ Finally, Petitioner has demonstrated that the Competitor has commenced providing video programming service within the Communities, has marketed its services in a manner that makes potential subscribers reasonably aware of its services, and otherwise satisfied the LEC effective competition test consistent with the evidentiary requirements set forth in the *Cable Reform Order*.¹¹

5. Based on the foregoing, we conclude that Petitioner has submitted sufficient evidence demonstrating that its cable system serving the Communities has met the LEC test and is subject to effective competition.

⁷See 47 U.S.C. § 543(l)(D).

⁸See *Implementation of Cable Act Reform Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, 14 FCC Rcd 5296, 5305-06, ¶¶ 13-16 (1999) (“*Cable Reform Order*”).

⁹See 47 C.F.R. § 76.905(g). See also Petition in CSR 7826-E at 12.

¹⁰See Petition in CSR 7827-E at Exh. 7.

¹¹See *Cable Reform Order*, 14 FCC Rcd at 5305-06, ¶¶ 13-16. See also Petition in 7828-E at 5-11.

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

6. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the petitions for a determination of effective competition filed in the captioned proceeding by subsidiaries of Cablevision Systems Corporation **ARE GRANTED**.

7. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the certification to regulate basic cable service rates granted to, or exercised on behalf of, any of the Communities set forth on Attachment A **IS REVOKED**.

8. This action is taken pursuant to delegated authority pursuant to Section 0.283 of the Commission's rules.¹²

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Steven A. Broeckaert
Senior Deputy Chief, Policy Division, Media Bureau

¹²47 C.F.R. § 0.283.

ATTACHMENT A**CSR 7826-E, 7827-E, 7828-E****COMMUNITIES SERVED BY SUBSIDIARIES OF CABLEVISION SYSTEMS CORPORATION**

Communities	CUID(S)
--------------------	----------------

CSR 7826-E	
-------------------	--

Town of Ramapo	NY0448
----------------	--------

Ramapo Corridor	NY1662
-----------------	--------

CSR 7827-E	
-------------------	--

Town of Ramapo	NY1424
----------------	--------

CSR 7828-E	
-------------------	--

Village of Bellerose	NY0839
----------------------	--------